

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXIV

HELSINKI 2000 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

PAAVO CASTRÉN	<i>Vici and insulae: The Homes and Addresses of the Romans</i>	7
TIBOR GRÜLL	“ <i>Conquerors, Patriarchs and the Law of the Lord</i> ”. <i>Interpretation of a late antique Jewish epitaph</i>	23
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Livia and Nemesis</i>	39
TUA KORHONEN	<i>Rhetorical Strategies in Johan Paulinus’ (Lillienstedt) Finlandia (1678). A Versified Oration in Greek from the Baroque Period</i>	63
UTA-MARIA LIERTZ	<i>Zur Vorgeschichte organisierten Kaiserkultes im gallo-germanischen Raum</i>	89
JERZY LINDERSKI	<i>Banqueting</i>	101
LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	<i>A Faiyum Portrait Reconsidered</i>	109
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Notes on Some Greek Inscriptions of Imperial Date</i>	115
ERKKI SIRONEN	<i>Notes on the Language of Johan Paulinus’ Finlandia. A Baroque Eulogy in Greek Verses</i>	129
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CLXXIII–CLXXXIII</i>	149
CHRISTA STEINBY	<i>The Roman Boarding-bridge in the First Punic War. A Study of Roman Tactics and Strategy</i>	193
ANTERO TAMMISTO	<i>Nova bibliotheca Pompeiana I-II. Corrigenda ed addenda con una bibliografia pompeiana fennica</i>	211
JAANA VAAHTERA	<i>Observations on genus nominum in the Roman Grammarians</i>	233
ROLF WESTMAN	<i>Ergänzungen zu LSJ und dessen Rev. Suppl.</i>	253
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	259
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	315
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	319

NOTES ON SOME GREEK INSCRIPTIONS OF IMPERIAL DATE

OLLI SALOMIES

1. On Επιγραφές Βέροιας no. 280

The publication of the corpus of the inscriptions of Beroia by L. Gouнарopoulos and M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Επιγραφές κάτω Μακεδονίας, Τεύχος α'. Επιγραφές Βέροιας* (Athens 1998) is a major event for Greek epigraphical studies, especially for those in which the accent lies on the Roman period. The great number of interesting texts and the great quality of the work make this monumental book – a volume of more than 650 pages which includes unusually full indices and full photographic documentation – a most desirable publication indeed. Beroea – an important city – can now be considered a privileged site, as the population (as reflected by onomastics) was already covered, in 1988, by the excellent monograph by A.B. Tataki, *Ancient Beroia. Prosopography and Society* (Meletemata vol. 8), which has the extra advantage of including the people attested in the inscriptions of Leukopetra (just south of Beroia), a site not included in this edition. As Takaki was referring to a great number of unpublished Beroean texts, it is very good to have them all collected in one corpus.

However, my aim here is not to give an overall evaluation of the book, but to say a few words on inscription no. 280,¹ of which a photo is given on

¹ However, let me use this occasion to make a suggestion regarding another inscription. In no. 120 (dated by the editors to the second century), the σύνεδροι honour a certain Π. Μ. Κυϊντιανός Μακέδων, making a reference to the man's ἀρετή. The *M.* is explained as a second praenomen, Μ(ἄρκος). I am not saying this is impossible (in fact, a book written by me on Roman praenomina is quoted on this matter), but I cannot help wondering whether one could not adduce here another man from Beroea, a splendid character indeed, namely Π. Μέμ(μιος) Κυϊντιανός Καπίτων, ἐν προβολαῖς μακεδονιαρχικαῖς γενόμενος, known from inscription no. 78 (dated by the editors to the early third century). I think that it is more than probable that the two could be related, which, again, makes me

p. 599. The stone, now in the museum of Beroea (the exact findspot is unknown), has clearly been cut off a larger monument, this operation resulting in only parts of two lines being preserved (and it now being impossible to determine the nature of the original monument). What one can read now is (to reproduce the edited text) Σεγοῦννος Ζωσ[-----] / Φικτω[ρι-----]. Clearly we have here two persons. The nomen *Fictorius*, not very common in general, is not unknown in Macedonia,² but the name – obviously a nomen – *Segunnius* is indeed "ἀμάρτυρο". However, something quite similar can be adduced to illustrate this name and, in fact, the whole inscription. Vigilant readers of both the volume on Beroea and of that most remarkable work, G. Mendel's *Musées impériaux Ottomans. Catalogue des sculptures grecques, romaines et byzantines*, cannot help turning their thoughts to a funerary stele of unknown provenance published in Mendel with a facsimile in vol. III (1914), p. 150f. no. 936. The text of the inscription runs as follows: Φικτωρία Πῶλλα, [Τίτ]ος Σέγουννος / Ζώσιμος, Τίτος Σέγουννος Ἰουκοῦν/δος, Τίτος Σέγουννος Πωλλιανὸς / ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ μνήμης χάριν / ἦρωα. (I am reproducing the accentuation of the editor; the first two lines are inscribed above the relief, the last three, beginning with *δος*, below.) I am not absolutely certain about the relationships of these people (but the first two must be a couple, the other two Segunni probably a son and a grandson); instead, I think it is practically certain that the two persons mentioned in the beginning are identical with the people in the inscription from Beroea. This, again, makes one wonder about two things. First, there is the problem of the name. The facsimile of Mendel clearly reproduces the nomen as Σέγουννος not only once but three times,³ whereas in the inscription from Beroea the name is given – from the photo it emerges that there is no doubt about this – in the form Σεγοῦννος (I think this accentuation is preferable). At this moment the only explanation I can

suspect that the *M.* in the nomenclature of Quintianus Macedo should be interpreted not as the praenomen, but as an abbreviation of *Memmius*. The man was certainly a well-known person in Beroea so people could be expected to interpret correctly the admittedly extreme abbreviation.

² Instances from Dion and Pella are referred to by me in A. D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East* (Meletemata 21, 1996) 126 n. 87.

³ It is true that in line 1, the facsimile seems to have ΣΕΓΝΟΥΝΝΙΟΣ (sic), but this seems to be a mistake of Mendel's or of someone else who drew the facsimile, and in any case the extra N is present here, too, and there is no doubt about the rendering of the name in lines 2 and 3.

produce is that Σεγνοῦννος is the correct form of the name and that the form given in the text from Beroea, where the first *n* is omitted, is based on a mistake of the stonecutter. He may not have been used to this rather exotic nomen, no doubt of Celtic origin,⁴ equipped with perhaps a few too many *n*'s from the stonecutter's point of view.

There remains the question of whether the stele in Istanbul could be attributed to Beroea. (Obviously, one does not have to think about the possibility that the stone in Beroea could have been brought there from Constantinople.) There do not seem to be serious objections to this: the Archaeological Museum in Constantinople received finds from all around the Ottoman Empire⁵ to which N. Greece belonged until 1912. The stele, of which the top has broken off, exemplifies a type very well represented in Beroea from the third century BC to the Roman period.⁶ The formulations also appear in inscriptions from Beroea; for ἥρωσ see no. 179ff., for μνήμησ (or μνεΐασ) χάριτι see no. 208ff., for the two being combined see no. 336ff. (with the accusative ἥρωα e.g. in 336. 341. 345f.), and for the form ὑός see the index, p. 497. In conclusion, I suggest that there are good reasons to attribute the stele in Istanbul to Beroea. Since the stele certainly belongs to a funerary context, one might assume that the stone from Beroea is a fragment of a votive monument.

2. On I. Ephesos 3091 and on Cities setting up Honorific Monuments in Combination with Private Dedicators

The inscription I. Ephesos 3091 is, as seen by the editors, most probably another text in honour of L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus, proconsul of Asia in AD 244–7, a man known from a very great number of inscriptions from Ephesus and from other Asian cities (B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidium I* [1984] 236 n. 191) and no doubt a person of integrity and merit.

⁴ Cf. A. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz II* (1922) 1437-59 (material including the root *seg(o)-*).

⁵ Cf. e.g. Mendel, *op. cit.* 613f. no. 1404 for an interesting inscription from near Palmyra.

⁶ One could compare e.g. Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos no. 150, 152, 173, 178 (also with pilasters around the relief), 188, 191, 199 and many of those which follow (see the *πίνακες* in the same edition).

The inscription was clearly set up by the same two men as 3088 (also honouring Lollianus), Μ. Αὐρ. Φαῦστος and Μ. Αὐρ. Ἀλόφορος who, to judge from the long list of offices enumerated in both inscriptions, clearly were not men who were dissatisfied with their achievements. In any case, whereas in 3088 only the two men are mentioned as dedicators, in 3091 some trouble arises from the fact that here one finds, between the mention of the honorand and of the dedicators, a reference to the city of Ephesus, in the genitive [---] τῆς Ἐφεσίων / [πόλεως ---]. The passage preceding this mention is restored by the editors by adding ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος. Here we have a little problem, for this restoration produces the result that the inscription (or rather the monument to which the inscription was attached) was dedicated by the *boule* and the *demos* and by the two men. However, it is certainly not normal, at least in this period, to find a combination of dedicators consisting of the *boule* and the *demos* or of the *polis* on one hand and of individuals on the other, all appearing in the nominative.⁷ It is true that one can adduce some parallels; Gerlach op. cit. (n. 7) p. 28 and 30 offers altogether five instances, of great variation in phraseology, of which IG II/III² 2810 (ἡ πόλις ἡ Ἀσκαλωνιτῶν καὶ Λούκιοι Αἰμίλιοι Κᾶρος καὶ οἱ τούτου υἱοὶ Ἀπολλωνίδης καὶ Οὐειβιανὸς Ζηνόδωρος honouring the "polis of the Athenians", dated to the 2nd century AD), IG XII 3, 1058 (Pholegandros, ὁ δῆμος καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς Τειμῆς Σωσιτέλους honouring Tiberius) and IGR III 115 = OGI 529 (Sebastopolis, time of Hadrian, Μ. Ἀντώνιον Σεργία Ροῦφον ... ἡ Σεβαστοπολειτῶν πόλις ἐτείμησεν ... ἀνέθηκεν δὲ τοὺς ἀνδριάντας θυγατὴρ αὐτοῦ Ἀντωνία Μαξίμα) seem to be the only really useful ones. Moving on to the material not in Gerlach, it is, in fact, precisely in Ephesus that one observes two further instances. First,

⁷ When I say individuals, I do, of course, not mean groups of individuals (of varying degrees of cohesion) such as "Roman citizens" or "Roman businessmen" or (in the case of Delos) "people living on the island" which one commonly finds as dedicators of monuments together with a city (or the *boule* and the *demos* etc.); cf. G. Gerlach, *Griechische Ehreninschriften* (1908) 15–17 and e.g. (to mention only inscriptions honouring senators) I. Olympia 335 (probably Augustan); AE 1974, 634 (Attaleia, Augustan); CIL III 7043 = ILS 976 (Tiberian); SEG XIX 438 (Idomene in Macedonia, from the time of Claudius). Delos: ID 1624. 1626 (both Augustan). If restored correctly, the inscription from Lydae IGR III 521 = TAM II 132 (cf. W. Eck, ZPE 6 [1970] 74 n. 41) records the local ephebes (the expression being spelled incorrectly) dedicating a statue in honour of a Vespasianic governor together with the local *boule* and the *demos*. In the case of inscriptions honouring senators, it seems very hard to locate instances of this type after the first century AD.

there is the inscription I. Ephesos 738, in honour of the "legate of Caesar" L. Vibius Varus, most probably of Augustan date, which starts with [Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος] εἰμί[η]σαν and goes on, after the mention of the honorand and his titles, with Εὐοδίων Φιλοθέου πραγματευόμενος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ αἰτησάμενος ἀνέστησεν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ εὐεργέτην. Secondly, there is the Vespasianic inscription in honour of a young senator, L. Pedanius Secundus Pompeius Festus Munatianus (who seems to have been quaestor of Asia, see PIR² P 204), I. Ephesos 701, which begins with [Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος] εἰμί[η]σεν (the singular is common in the later period) and ends with Σκύμνο[ς κ]αὶ Θεόπομπος οἱ Σκύμνου τὸν ἴδιον εὐεργέτην after having enumerated the names and the *cursus* of the man.

The examples quoted from Gerlach are clearly all fairly special ones, and the coordination of a *polis* (or *demos*) is in these cases based on the very high status of the private dedicators (note that, in the inscription set up by the *polis* of Ascalon, the Aemilii belong to a family from Syria which was able to produce senators).⁸ On the other hand, it must be admitted that in the case of the texts from Ephesus, the dedicators, though certainly men of means, cannot perhaps be characterized as persons of very high social status. The businessman is not a local man at all (this is clear from the addition of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ), and in the case of the two sons of Scymnus we are dealing with men not otherwise mentioned in the numerous Ephesian inscriptions. The appearance of these two men and the businessman as dedicators on the same level as the Ephesian *boule* and the *demos* must come from the fact that the texts have been formulated by the dedicators themselves, and that, in doing this, they did not pay attention to normal epigraphic habits (note especially the surprising exclusion of Ephesus from the sphere of the *euergesia* of Vibius Varus; in considering this text, one must also note that this is, according to the "Wortindex", the only instance of αἰτοῦμαι used in this way in Ephesus). Furthermore, there is also the inscription of around 250

⁸ L. Aemilius Carus (cos. ca. 144) and his son of the same name (the two combined in PIR² A 338) certainly belong to the same family, there being also other reasons for considering the senators as originating in Syria (see L. Schumacher, *Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur Besetzung der vier hohen römischen Priesterkollegien im Zeitalter der Antonine und der Severer* [Diss. Mainz 1973], 247f.; G. Alföldy, *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen* (1977) 319; H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum* [1979] 208f.; I. Piso, *Fasti provinciae Daciae I* [1993] 106).

from Aphrodisias, AE 1981, 770, set up by Τιβ. Κλ. Μαρκιανός, ὁ πρῶτος ἄρχων in honour of T. Oppius Aelianus Asclepiodotus, governor of Caria-Phrygia and a citizen of the city. However, the expression ἡ πατρίς, appearing right at the beginning of the text, cannot be considered as being, in addition to Claudius Marcianus, another dedicator of the monument, on one hand because it is separated from the main text by the expression ἀγαθῆ τύχη, and on the other because the πατρίς cannot be the subject of a clause where the object (i.e., the honorand) is characterized as κτίστην καὶ σωτήρα καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδος.⁹ I suspect that the addition of ἡ πατρίς at the beginning of the text was simply intended as a reminder to the hurried passer-by of the important fact that the honorand was not only a governor but a man from Aphrodisias.¹⁰

Be that as it may, what is in any case certain is that inscriptions mentioning as dedicators both a city (or the *boule* and the *demos* etc.) and a private person, both appearing in the nominative, were quite uncommon and must be thought of as special cases. But the fact that both a city and a private person acted together in setting up a honorific monument could, of course, be expressed somewhat differently, namely by putting either the city or the individual in the nominative and referring to the other participant in some other way. I am here thinking of the two types ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος ... ἀναστήσαντος τοῦ δεινός ..., and ὁ δεινός ... ψηφισαμένης τῆς βουλῆς ... (Gerlach, *op. cit.* 23), and in this case we have, of course, a lot of material. To return to the inscription from Ephesus, we find here the two Aurelii mentioned in the nominative. It seems obvious that a more plausible restoration of the text than that presented in I. Ephesos 3091 must be on the lines of the ψηφισαμένης τῆς βουλῆς type. There are many examples of honorific monuments set up by private individuals, mentioning in the inscriptions that the erection of the monument was done according to a *psephisma* (or *doxan*, *krima*, etc.), normally of the *boule* and the *demos*. It may not be possible to determine who exactly took the initiative in these

⁹ For this use of καὶ here, meant to point out that the beneficent activities of the honorand were by no means limited to his home town, cf. e.g. Milet I 9, 171 no. 344; IGR III 520. 523 = TAM II 133. 134 (Lydae); somewhat differently, with a reference only to an office, not also to benefactions IGR III 616 = TAM II 277 (Xanthus; Rémy, Carrières [below n. 19] 313 seems to be wondering about the formulation); OGI 500 (Aphrodisias).

¹⁰ For an inscription from Aphrodisias where the πατρίς does appear as the dedicant of a monument see e.g. CIG 2797 (in honour of a *rhetor*).

cases¹¹ but of course it is clear that we are talking mostly of monuments set up in a public space. A reference to a *psephisma* can be formulated in many ways, most often by the use of the genitive absolute, by the use of the dative ψηφίσματι, or by the use of κατά followed by the accusative.¹² In Ephesus (the habits of which are important from our point of view), one notes the mention of a *psephisma* in a number of honorific inscriptions;¹³ as for inscriptions in honour of senators, observe I. Ephesos 619A, an inscription set up in the time of Commodus in honour of a proconsul by Τείμαιος Ἀττάλο[υ], ὁ γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου etc. Here the mention of a *psephisma* is formulated as καθῶς ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐψηφίσαντο. In I. Ephesos 4110, set up in about the middle of the second century by a certain Τί. Claudius Frontinus in honour of the Ephesian senator P. Vedius Antoninus Phaedrus Sabinianus, the genitive absolute is used in formulating the reference to the *psephisma*: [ψ]ηφισαμένης τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου. *Polis* substitutes for the *boule* and the *demos* in 3036, an inscription set up around the middle of the second century by the city of Selge in honour of a proconsul of Pamphylia–Lycaonia originating from Ephesus, the act here, too, being referred to by using the genitive absolute, ψηφισαμένης τῆς πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ δις νεωκόρου τῶν Σεβαστῶν Ἐφεσίων πόλεως.¹⁴ In a (mainly) Latin text, I. Ephesos 718, a procedure on

¹¹ C. P. Jones, *Chiron* 29 (1999) 18 seems to imply that it was the polis which acted first; on the other hand, G. Klaffenbach, *Griechische Epigraphik* (1966) 64 and M. Guarducci, *L'epigrafia greca dalle origini al basso impero* (1987) 161, assert (in my view more plausibly) that in these cases the idea was the dedicator's, who turned to the city for some authorization. But since we do not really know the circumstances in each case, it is perhaps best to join Gerlach, *op. cit.* 88, in thinking that the initiative could in these cases be taken by either the *polis* or the individual.

¹² See Gerlach, *op. cit.* 88ff.

¹³ E.g., I. Ephesos 669. 951. 1629 (the abbreviation ψ. β. δ. being used); a *psephisma* of only the *boule* is mentioned in 1548. In 821, an inscription set up by the city of Apollonia on the Rhyndacus in honour of a procurator, the *polis* the *psephisma* of which is mentioned seems to be not Ephesus, but the city of Apollonia itself.

¹⁴ For the use of the genitive absolute cf. also e.g. I. Ephesos 2053 (ILS 9469), an inscription set up by a local notable in honour of the city of Carthage. A similar reference to a *psephisma* must also be supplied in the beginning of I. Ephesos 3050, set up in the Severan period by the ἱερὸν μισθωτήριον ("das Rentamt des Tempels") in honour of C. Iulius Philippus, τὸν κράτιστον πρεσβευτὴν καὶ λογιστή[ν], where the text, fragmentary in the beginning, now starts with the words Ἐφ[ε]σ[ί]ων [πόλ]εως before moving to the name, offices and merits of the honorand. (No restoration is suggested by the editors.)

the same line is rendered (in the beginning of the text) as *ex decreto ordinis civitatis Ephesiorum* τῆς πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ δις νεωκόρου τῶν Σεβαστῶν, where the Greek text (not really translatable into Latin) seems to be meant as a finer definition of *civitatis*.¹⁵ To these inscriptions I would like to add the text in honour of the proconsul Lollianus. I think that the restoration πόλεως at the beginning of line 3 is beyond any doubt; as for line 2, perhaps ψηφισαμένης is indeed the most suitable restoration. Another question is whether one should think of adding some qualification of Ephesus in between; there does not seem to be very much space, but e.g. τῆς λαμπροτάτης Ἐφεσίων might fit. The only problem is that, although other cities are designated as λαμπρόταται in Ephesian inscriptions,¹⁶ longer designations of the type quoted above are usually applied to the city of Ephesus itself. On the other hand, λαμπροτάτη is not completely unheard-of,¹⁷ and perhaps one might settle for this.¹⁸

¹⁵ This text must be taken into consideration when restoring the inscription in honour A. Iunius Pastor CIL III 6076 = ILS 1095 = I. Ephesos 1543, now beginning with [*s*]plendidissima[*e*] civitatis Ephesiorum τῆς πρώτης etc., where something must be missing in the beginning (otherwise one would have to share the perplexity of Dessau, n. 1 on ILS 1095: "ceterum non perspicitur quo pertineat Ephesi mentio"). Cf. on this text E. Weber, in: H. Friesinger – F. Krinzinger (eds.), 100 Jahre österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos. Akten des Symposions Wien 1995 (ÖAW, Denkschr. 260, 1999) 144, who, however, thinks that the assumption that something is missing in the beginning is evitable (ibid. n. 27). But I cannot see what use there is of adducing I. Ephesos 1541, where the genitive in the beginning is followed by ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος and which thus represents a different type of text.

¹⁶ E.g. I. Ephesos 243. 678 (τῆς λαμπρᾶς Κυζικηνῶν πόλεως). 2053. 2054. 3056 (?).

¹⁷ See I. Ephesos 212 (in a letter a Caracalla to the Ephesians). 714. 799 (ἡ λαμπροτάτη τῶν Ἐφεσίων μητρόπολις setting up something). 878 (λαμπρᾶς). 1403. 3126.

¹⁸ Having touched upon the subject of the *boule* and the *demos* being introduced into honorific inscriptions, let me suggest a restoration for an inscription from Iasos, I. Iasos 86 from around AD 250. This is a text set up by [ἡ Ἰασ]έων κρατίστη [πόλις] in honour of a consular, τὸν ἑαυτῆ[ς εὐεργέ]την, the text ending here with βου[λ---]. Now there are some inscriptions which, although set up by a city, also mention a *psefisma* (see e.g. I. Olympia 355. 484; AE 1949, 265 [Buthrotum]; Corinth 8, 3, 125; and cf. inscriptions which refer to a *psefisma* or something amounting to that but do not mention a dedicator, this in many cases meaning that they were set up by a city [cf. R. Haensch, *Capita provinciarum* (1997) 595 n. 88]: e.g. I. Ephesos 2068, IGR I 630f., OGI 500), and in view of this one could think, in the case of the inscription from Iasos, of a restoration of the type of βου[λῆς καὶ δήμου ψηφίσματι].

3. On an Inscription of Attaleia in Pamphylia (IGR III 776 = SEG XVII 572) and the Nomenclature of the province of Lycia–Pamphylia

In an inscription from Attaleia, IGR III 776 = SEG XVII 572, set up by the local *boule* and the *demos* in honour of the proconsul P. Aelius Brutt[ius] Lucianus – I would like to think that this operation should be dated to about the Severan period –,¹⁹ the honorand is defined as τὸν [λαμ]/π<ρ>ότατον ἀνθύπ[ατον / ἐπαρχεί]ας Λυκ[ίας, / τὸν εὐερ]γέτ[ην]. As far as the mention of the province goes, this is the reading both in the IGR and in SEG, and it is this reading which is quoted with no sign of disagreement by B. Rémy, locc. cit. (n. 19) and by Thomasson, loc. cit. (n. 19). But there is a problem with this reconstruction of the text, namely a problem concerning the name of the province. What I am wondering about is, whether the province of which Bruttius Lucianus was the governor, normally known as "Lycia–Pamphylia", could be referred to simply as "Lycia", and also, whether this could have happened in Attaleia, a city which was situated not in Lycia but in Pamphylia.

It is true that there is an instance of the province being referred to simply as "Lycia" even after the time of Vespasian, when the double province of Lycia and Pamphylia (and including territory in Pisidia) was definitively formed,²⁰ this instance being a funerary epigram from Athens, IG

¹⁹ B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi Praesidium I* (1984) 284 no. 49 assumes that the proconsulate should be dated to the second or the third century, but this dating seems too rough. (B. Rémy, *Les fastes sénatoriaux des provinces romaines d'Anatolie au Haut-Empire* [1988] 192; id., *Les carrières sénatoriales dans les provinces d'Anatolie au Haut-Empire* [1989] 326 no. 279 says the man is "indatable".) Because of the item *P. Aelius*, reflecting Hadrian in one way or another, this man can hardly have been active before Septimius Severus, as both in the case of new citizens and in that of imperial freedmen one has to postulate at least two – but probably more often even more – generations before the descendants start to produce senators. On the other hand, the style of the inscription, with the dedicator coming in the beginning and the laudatory section consisting apparently of no more than the simple and classical τὸν εὐερ]γέτ[ην, does not favour a date much later than the Severan period.

²⁰ Cf. W. Eck, *ZPE* 6 (1970) 65–75; B. Rémy, *L'évolution administrative de l'Anatolie aux trois premiers siècles de notre ère* (1986) 62; H. Brandt, *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft Pamphyliens und Pisidiens im Altertum* (*Asia Minor Studien* 7, 1992) 97–99; M. Sartre, *L'Asie Mineure et l'Anatolie d'Alexandre à Dioclétien* (1995) 174; B. Levick, *Vespasian* (1999) 146.

II/III² 13012 = W. Peek, *Griechische Versinschriften* (1957) 1701, where a certain Fortunatus (a slave, one presumes) is said to have "left behind" Πούδεντα ... ἀνθύπατον Λυκίας. However, an epigram from Athens does not seem to be a reliable guide as to the nomenclature of a Roman province,²¹ and in any case, the source material indicates that, in an honorific inscription from Pamphylia, Λυκία is not the name one expects to be used of the province. Παμφυλία, also attested as the name of the whole province in one inscription,²² would be better, but does, of course, not come into question in this text in which Lycia was certainly mentioned. In any case, the material on the nomenclature of the province, not too difficult to come by,²³ gives us the following picture of the matter. In inscriptions from outside the province in which the double name is used, the order is practically always (for the three exceptions see below at nn. 33–35) Lycia, Pamphylia, the instances ranging from inscriptions from Asia Minor to military diplomas and from the 80s of the first century to the middle of the third.²⁴ As for inscriptions from Lycia–Pamphylia itself,²⁵ the same order is constantly used in inscriptions set

²¹ Note also that Παμφυλία (– – ∪ –) cannot easily be accommodated into dactylic verse.

²² I. Ephesos 814 (= B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidium* III [1990] 60 no. 38), set up by Laodicea in Syria in honour of C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus after his governorship in Syria.

²³ Most of the relevant texts are quoted by Rémy, *Fastes* (n. 19) and by Thomasson, *op. cit.* (n. 19), to which some new, but not many, finds must be added.

²⁴ The order Lycia – Pamphylia in inscriptions from outside the province (within the groups, the instances are enumerated in chronological order): Asia: all inscriptions of C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus (IGR IV 275. 373. 375. 382ff., from Pergamum; Didyma II 151; I. Ephesos 3033f.); I. Ephesos 682 (cf. SEG XXX 1312). 713 (Pompeius Falco). 805. 3038. 3707 (Palaeapolis); ILS 8842 = IGR IV 1741 (Hierocaesarea). Galatia: IGR III 300 = JRS 3 (1913) 260 no. 5 (Pisidian Antioch, 80s); IGR III 238 = RECAM II no. 414 cf. SEG XXXIX 1517 (Tavium); SEG VI 555 (Antioch). Cilicia: ILS 1036 (Pompeius Falco). Greece: IG VII 1866 (Thespieae). Moesia inferior: AE 1957, 336 = ISM II 45 (Tomi, Pompeius Falco). Italy: ILS 1026 (Cures). 1035 (Tarracina, Pompeius Falco); CIL X 6663 + 6665 + 8292, cf. W. Eck, *ZPE* 37 (1980) 36f. (Antium); CIL IX 973 (Compsa); CIL VI 31696 = 41195; CIL XIV 3611 = *Inscr. It.* IV 1, 128 (Tibur); CIL VI 31774 and 37078 (Virius Lupus); CIL XI 6164 (Suasa). Africa: ILS 1283 (C. Septimius Severus); AE 1905, 52 (Virius Lupus). Diplomas: RMD 161 (138 AD). 67 (163). EA 31 (1999) 77–82 (165/6). CIL XVI 128 (178). – The order in AE 1975, 403 (Albingaunum) is uncertain.

²⁵ Although the opposite is sometimes said (for a recent statement note B. E. Thomasson, *Opusc. Rom.* 24 (1999) 171 on no. 34:26a), the name of the province was in fact often mentioned even in inscriptions from the same province, at least from about the time of Vespasian. (In inscriptions recording the *cursus* – a less common category – it was of

up in Lycian cities, such inscriptions being known from the seventies of the first century to the time of Septimius Severus.²⁶ The same goes for three of the four relevant texts from Pisidian cities included in the province, these three all being from the the middle or from the later third century.²⁷ Furthermore, the order is always Lycia, Pamphylia in inscriptions adding a further name to the nomenclature of the province²⁸ or in inscriptions, normally pertaining to equestrian officers, enumerating various districts in Asia Minor.²⁹

However, when one moves on to Pamphylia, things change. In the material (admittedly not very large),³⁰ there is not a single example of the province being called "Lycia–Pamphylia" (not to speak of "Lycia"); here the province is invariably referred to as Pamphylia–Lycia. This is the case in texts from Attaleia (AE 1927, 27 = SEG VI 648 cf. W. Eck, ZPE 6 [1970] 73 n. 37, 70s, set up in honour of the legate Luscius Ocrea),³¹ Perge (AE 1986, 686 = I. Perge 154, 140s, a Latin inscription in honour of the legate Voconius Saxa; I. Perge 158, 160s, Vigellius Saturninus), and Side (Nollé, Side im Altertum no. 58 cf. SEG XLII 1232, also from the 160s and honouring the same legate Vigellius Saturninus).³² Outside Pamphylia, this order is found

course practically impossible to omit the name of the province.)

²⁶ Inscriptions referring to the province by name are attested in Myra (IGR iii 724), Oenoanda (SEG XXXIV 1312 cf. XLV 1817; IGR III 500, col. iii, 8ff.), Patara (TAM II 421, Ca), Phaselis (TAM II 1201 a + b = SEG XXXI 1300), Tlos (TAM II 563. 569. 571. 573. 574), Xanthos (AE 1981, 826a. 829. 830).

²⁷ AE 1995, 1541 (Cremna); AE 1990, 981 = I. Selge 12; TAM iii 1, 89 (Termessus).

²⁸ Lycia – Pamphylia – Isauria: MAMA VI 74 (end of 2nd cent.); Lycia – Pamphylia – Pisidia: IGBulg. 884 = 5400 = AE 1966, 376 (Λυκίας must no doubt be restored in the lacuna before the mention of Pamphylia).

²⁹ See ILS 1372 (*e[xpeditio]nis pe[r] Asiam L[y]ciam Pamph[y]liam et Phr[y]giam*). 1396. 1426. 1449; MAMA VI 97 = L. Robert, La Carie II 40; AE 1955, 273 (probably); and the inscription from Caunus cited in PIR² C 519.

³⁰ But new honorific inscriptions from Perge will appear in the second volume of the publication of the inscriptions from Perge by S. Sahin (see R. Haensch, *Capita provinciarum* [1997] 610), although, to judge from the descriptions given by Haensch, it does not seem likely that these inscriptions, as far as preserved, would include mentions of the province.

³¹ I think that [καὶ Λυκίας] must be restored at the end of the inscription (thus also, although with some hesitation, W. Eck, ZPE 6 [1970] 73)

³² Cf. also IGR III 778 = OGI 567 (Attaleia, in honour of the equestrian M. Gavius

three times, once, probably in the later second century, in Selge in Pisidia (but belonging to the province of Lycia–Pamphylia and geographically close to, and having some connections with, Pamphylia),³³ once in Pisidian Antioch in the province of Galatia,³⁴ and once in an acephalous votive inscription from Cos.³⁵

The bottom line here is, then, that there is no certain instance of the province being called "Lycia–Pamphylia" in Pamphylian cities, and this should, I think, be taken into consideration when restoring fragmentary Pamphylian inscriptions recording the double province by name. However, in practice this is often overlooked; note (in addition to the text we are discussing) e.g., the restorations of certain texts from Attaleia³⁶ and Side.³⁷ On the other hand, S. Sahin restores [*provinciae Pamphyliae et Lyci]ae* in the new inscription from Perge, I. Perge 156 (later 2nd cent.).³⁸ In any case,

Gallicus), τετειμημένον πολειτ[ε]ρίαις ... ὑπό τε τῶν ἐν Παμφυλίᾳ πόλεων καὶ τῶν ἐν Λυκίᾳ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ etc.

³³ I. Ephesos 3036, set up in Ephesus by the Σελγέων [π]ρό[λ]ις in honour of the Ephesian Cn. Pompeius Hermippus Aelianus, former proconsul of the province. As to Pamphylian influence in Selge, note J. Nollé and F. Schindler, *Die Inschriften von Selge* (IK 37, 1991) 14 on connections with Aspendos, and *ibid.* 47f. T 42 (Αὐρ. Ἐπάγαθος Σελγεὺς τῆς Παμφυλίας in Cyaneae). (In a later text from Selge one finds the order Lycia, Pamphylia, see n. 27.)

³⁴ ILS 9485 in honour of the legate (in the early 80s) Caristianus Fronto, originating from Antioch. Note that Caristianus Fronto himself uses the order Lycia – Pamphylia in the inscription from Antioch honouring his wife, IGR III 300 = JRS 3 (1913) 262 no. 5.

³⁵ M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (1993) 224 no. EV 210, set up by someone who had been a senatorial or an equestrian official [----- κ]αὶ Ἀσίας καὶ Παμφυλίας καὶ Λυκίας καὶ [-----]. Perhaps one should think of an equestrian official, as the enumeration of provinces reminds one of the texts referred to in n. 29. On the other hand, one finds a similar enumeration, somewhat lacking nuance, also in the inscription of the senator Pompeius Falco, I.Ephesos 713.

³⁶ [Λυκίας καὶ Παμφυλίας] is restored at the end of the inscription SEG XVII 568 = AE 1972, 610 by Rémy, Carrières (n. 19) 59; *id.*, *Fastes* (n. 19) 167, and the same restoration appears in the case of SEG XVII 569 = AE 1972, 615 in addition to Rémy, Carrières 289 (in *Fastes* 168 we find only Παμφυλίας) also in the AE and the SEG.

³⁷ AE 1966, 463 = B.E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidum III* (1990) no. 33 = Nollé, *Side im Altertum I* no. 57, where the restoration given in all of the editions referred to above is [ἐπαρχείας Λυκίας καὶ Παμφυλ]ίας.

³⁸ This text is now studied by W. Eck in ZPE 131 (2000) 251–7, who shows that this cursus belongs to M. Gavius Crispus Numisius Iunior, and that the restorations (implying e. g. that the honorand moved on from the praetorship to the proconsulate of Lycia–

the material presented above shows that, in the inscription from Attaleia, IGR III 776 = SEG XVII 572, the restoration ἐπαρχεί]ας Λυκ[ίας cannot be correct. So why not simply skip ἐπαρχεί]ας and substitute Παμφυλί]ας? Perhaps the reason for the restoration of ἐπαρχεί]ας before Λυκ[ίας was motivated by the fact that some scholars felt that a καί would have been needed or at least useful before Λυκ[ίας in the case of a mention also of Pamphylia. However, although it is certainly true that it was somewhat more common to insert καί between the two names, the asyndetic form is also well attested both in Greek³⁹ and also (although this is not really important in this connection) in Latin⁴⁰ inscriptions. Considering this, and the fact that a mention of Pamphylia is certainly needed in this text, and, furthermore, the fact that the addition of ἐπαρχεί]ας, although possible, is in no way necessary or desirable, I conclude that the most suitable restoration of the inscription is ἀνθύπ[ατον / Παμφυλί]ας Λυκ[ίας.

University of Helsinki

Pamphylia) must be modified. The restoration of the name of the province by Sahin is described as "wenig wahrscheinlich" at 252 n. 5, it being probable that the cursus has been formulated by the honorand himself, who, again, would have used the "normal" designation "Lycia–Pamphylia". This is true; and the "normal" order was certainly used in the inscription from Antium in honour of the same man (n. 24). However, the fact remains that there is no certain instance of the "normal" order being used in Pamphylia, and it seems to me quite probable that the nomenclature of the province could have been modified in this case in order to conform to the local habits.

³⁹ The asyndetic form is attested in inscriptions of A. Iulius Quadratus from Ephesus (I. Ephesus 3033f.) and from Didyma (Didyma II 151; note that in all these texts καί is added in references to the provinces of Pontus–Bithynia and Creta–Cyrene), whereas the inscriptions from Pergamum (n. 24) insert καί. Further instances of the omission of καί are I. Ephesos 3707, IGR III 238, SEG VI 555, I. Selge 12, TAM III 1, 87, IG VII 1866.

⁴⁰ CIL VI 21774. 37078; CIL XIV 3611 = Inscr. It. IV 1, 128; CIL IX 973; CIL XI 6164; CIL XVI 128 (and probably also the diploma EA 31 (1999) 77–82); AE 1995, 1541 (Cremna).